UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/552,801	10/11/2005	Bernhard Gleich	DE 030109	4528	
<sup>24737</sup> PHILIPS INTE	7590 05/21/200 LLECTUAL PROPER		EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001 LACYK, JOHN P BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510	JOHN P				
BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3735		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/21/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/552,801	GLEICH ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
• •	John P. Lacyk	3735	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a			ss
eriod for Reply		•	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mai earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO ute, cause the application to become a	ICATION.  a reply be timely filed  ONTHS from the mailing date of this commandation (as u.S.C. § 133).	
tatus			•
_			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	 nis action is non-final.		
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ✓ The street of the same of the s		tters prosecution as to the me	erite ie
closed in accordance with the practice unde			ciilo io
	. In parto quayro, 1000 o.	2, 100 0.0. 210.	
isposition of Claims	·		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.		·
Application Papers			
	nor	•	
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ a		hy the Evaminer	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corn	<u> </u>		1.121(d)
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		- / / - / · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority docume</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority docume</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the pieces.</li> </ul>	ents have been received. ents have been received in	Application No	age
application from the International Bure	· .	in received in this National Ote	<b>19</b> 0
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li	•	ot received.	
Coo the attached detailed office detail for a li	opios in		
Attachment(s)	🗖	0 (070 (10)	
1) M Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Motice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		y Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		f Informal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🗀 Other: _		

Art Unit: 3735

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 10 include language in step d) that states "if required", this renders the claims indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. In claims 2 and 11, the inductive means lacks proper antecedent basis.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kraus, Jr. et al (6,470,220).

Kraus, Jr. discloses an apparatus and method for "influencing" magnetic particles in a target region by generating a magnetic field having a first low magnetic strength region (first sub-zone) and a second high magnetic strength region (second sub-zone) and changing the position in space of the regions to "influence" the magnetic particles. The examiner is considering the heating of the magnetic particles as "influencing". Also the

Application/Control Number: 10/552,801 Page 3

Art Unit: 3735

"interfering material" is considered to be the tumor taught in Kraus, Jr. and the "interfering material" would inherently be detected in order to properly position the magnetic particles in the correct location.

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1-13 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of copending Application No. 10/552,803. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present claims include a means for detecting interfering material, which would be an inherent step and/or means in order to allow for the magnetic particles to be properly positioned with respect to the "interfering material" prior to heating the particles.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John P. Lacyk whose telephone number is 571-272-4728. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chuck Marmor, II can be reached on 571-272-4730. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

John P Lacyk

Primary Examiner Art Unit 3735